

EXHIBIT C

1 Guido Saveri (22349) guido@saveri.com
R. Alexander Saveri (173102) rick@saveri.com
2 Geoffrey C. Rushing (126910) grushing@saveri.com
Cadio Zirpoli (179108) cadio@saveri.com
3 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.
706 Sansome Street
4 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 217-6810
5 Facsimile: (415) 217-6813

6 *Interim Lead Counsel for the Direct Purchaser*
7 *Plaintiffs*

8
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
11

12 IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
13 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

MASTER FILE NO.. 07-cv-5944 SC

14 This Document Relates to:

15 ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS
16
17

DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS'
RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT LG
ELECTRONICS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF
REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

18 PROPOUNDING PARTY: LG ELECTRONICS, INC.

19 RESPONDING PARTY: DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

20 SET NO.: ONE

21 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Direct Purchaser
22 Plaintiffs ("Plaintiffs") hereby respond to defendant LG Electronics, Inc.'s First Set of Request for
23 Production of Documents as follows:

24 PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

25 Nothing herein should be construed as an admission by Plaintiffs respecting the
26 admissibility or relevance of any fact or document, or of the truth or accuracy of any
27 characterization or statement of any kind contained in defendant LG Electronics, Inc.'s First Set of
28 Request for Production of Documents ("Request for Production"). Plaintiffs have not completed

812446.2

MDL NO. 1917

DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT LG ELECTRONICS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION

1 their investigation of the facts relating to this case or its preparation for trial. All responses and
2 objections contained herein are based only upon such information and such documents as are
3 presently available to and specifically known to Plaintiffs. It is anticipated that independent
4 investigation, legal research and analysis will supply additional facts and add meaning to known
5 facts, as well as establish entirely new factual conclusions and legal contentions, all of which may
6 lead to substantial additions to, changes in and variations from the responses set forth herein.

7 The following objections and responses are made without prejudice to Plaintiffs' right to
8 produce at trial, or otherwise, evidence regarding any subsequently discovered information,
9 evidence and/or documents. Plaintiffs accordingly reserve the right to modify and amend any and
10 all responses herein as research is completed and contentions are made.

11 GENERAL OBJECTIONS

12 Plaintiffs object generally to the Request for Production, and to each individual request
13 therein, on the following grounds, each of which is incorporated by reference in the responses to
14 the individual requests below. Each response set forth below incorporates, is subject to, and does
15 not waive any of these general objections.

16 1. Plaintiffs object to each and every request to the extent that it seeks disclosure of
17 information containing privileged communications or other matters protected by the attorney-
18 client privilege, the work-product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or doctrine. None of
19 Plaintiffs' specific responses shall be construed to mean that Plaintiffs intend to provide privileged
20 or work-product information in the absence of an intentional waiver. Any inadvertent disclosure
21 of privileged or work-product information shall not constitute a waiver of an otherwise valid claim
22 of privilege or other protection, and any failure to assert a privilege or other protection as to
23 certain information shall not be deemed to constitute a waiver of the privilege or other protection
24 as to any other information so protected.

25 2. The Request for Production, and certain of the requests contained therein, are
26 unreasonably overbroad in scope, and thus burdensome and oppressive, in that each such request
27 seeks information pertaining to items and matters that are not relevant to the subject matter of this
28 action, or, if relevant, are so remote therefrom as to make its disclosure of little or no practical

1 benefit to defendant, while placing a wholly unwarranted burden and expense on Plaintiffs in
2 locating, reviewing and producing the requested information.

3 3. The Request for Production, and certain of the requests contained therein, are
4 burdensome and oppressive, in that ascertaining the information necessary to respond thereto, and
5 to produce documents in accordance therewith, would require the review and compilation of
6 information from multiple locations, and voluminous records and files, thereby involving
7 substantial time of Plaintiffs' employees and great expense to Plaintiffs, whereas the information
8 sought to be obtained by defendant would be of little use or benefit to defendant.

9 4. The Request for Production, and certain of the requests contained therein, purports
10 to impose on Plaintiffs obligations or responsibilities in excess of those imposed by the Federal
11 Rules of Civil Procedure, the applicable Local Rules, any other applicable procedural rules, case
12 law, statutes governing the proper scope of discovery, or applicable Court Orders.

13 5. The Request for Production, and certain of the requests contained therein, calls for
14 documents which are outside the possession, custody or control of Plaintiffs.

15 6. Plaintiffs object to each request, instruction, or definition to the extent it seeks
16 information that is already in the possession of the propounding party or the other defendants or is
17 obtainable from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome or less expensive.

18 7. Plaintiffs object to each request, instruction, or definition to the extent that it
19 impermissibly seeks the premature disclosure of experts and expert information or requires
20 Plaintiffs to disclose analyses, comparative analyses, opinions, or theories that will be the subject
21 of expert testimony.

22 8. To the extent any term in the Request for Production is defined in the Federal
23 Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs will interpret such term as it is so defined and not as defined in
24 the Request for Production.

25 9. The Request for Production, and certain of the requests contained therein, seek to
26 have Plaintiffs furnish information and identify documents that are a matter of public record and,
27 therefore, are equally available to the propounding party as they are to Plaintiffs.

28 Plaintiffs' responses agreeing to produce documents in response to the requests should not

1 be construed as meaning that documents of the type requested exist, and should only be construed
 2 as indicating that Plaintiffs will produce documents of the type requested if they are in Plaintiffs'
 3 possession, custody or control, are not privileged or otherwise exempt from production, and can be
 4 located and produced through reasonable and good faith effort.

5 RESPONSES

6 REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

7 All Documents that support Your response to Interrogatory No. 1.

8 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

9 Plaintiffs incorporate the General Objections as though fully set forth herein. In particular,
 10 this request is premature in that discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
 11 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
 12 take depositions until November 1, 2010). This request seeks, in effect, a list of trial exhibits
 13 which is not yet required to be produced. Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
 14 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
 15 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
 16 documents that support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested documents are equally
 17 available to the propounding party. Plaintiffs further object to this request to the extent it calls for
 18 the production of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product
 19 doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, or that is otherwise privileged or immune from
 20 discovery. In addition, this request is compound, overbroad and contains multiple subparts, which
 21 if broken apart, contain numerous separate document requests. Subject to, and without waiving,
 22 the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

23 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
 24 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
 25 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
 26 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. At the present time, plaintiffs refer
 27 defendants to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in connection with the
 28 investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of employees of Chunghwa,

1 the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European Commission Statement of
2 Objections against CRT manufacturers.

3 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:**

4 All Documents that support Your response to Interrogatory No. 2.

5 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:**

6 Plaintiffs incorporate the General Objections as though fully set forth herein. In particular,
7 this request is premature in that discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
8 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
9 take depositions until November 1, 2010). This request seeks, in effect, a list of trial exhibits
10 which is not yet required to be produced. Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
11 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
12 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
13 documents that support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested documents are equally
14 available to the propounding party. Plaintiffs further object to this request to the extent it calls for
15 the production of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product
16 doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, or that is otherwise privileged or immune from
17 discovery. In addition, this request is compound, overbroad and contains multiple subparts, which
18 if broken apart, contain numerous separate document requests. Subject to, and without waiving,
19 the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

20 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
21 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
22 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
23 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. At the present time, plaintiffs refer
24 defendants to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in connection with the
25 investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of employees of Chunghwa,
26 the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European Commission Statement of
27 Objections against CRT manufacturers.

28

1 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:**

2 All Documents that support Your response to Interrogatory No. 3.

3 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:**

4 Plaintiffs incorporate the General Objections as though fully set forth herein. In particular,
5 this request is premature in that discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
6 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
7 take depositions until November 1, 2010). This request seeks, in effect, a list of trial exhibits
8 which is not yet required to be produced. Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
9 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
10 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
11 documents that support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested documents are equally
12 available to the propounding party. Plaintiffs further object to this request to the extent it calls for
13 the production of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product
14 doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, or that is otherwise privileged or immune from
15 discovery. In addition, this request is compound, overbroad and contains multiple subparts, which
16 if broken apart, contain numerous separate document requests. Subject to, and without waiving,
17 the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

18 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
19 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
20 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
21 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. At the present time, plaintiffs refer
22 defendants to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in connection with the
23 investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of employees of Chunghwa,
24 the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European Commission Statement of
25 Objections against CRT manufacturers.

26 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:**

27 All Documents that support Your response to Interrogatory No. 4.

1 RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

2 Plaintiffs incorporate the General Objections as though fully set forth herein. In particular,
 3 this request is premature in that discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
 4 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
 5 take depositions until November 1, 2010). This request seeks, in effect, a list of trial exhibits
 6 which is not yet required to be produced. Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
 7 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
 8 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
 9 documents that support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested documents are equally
 10 available to the propounding party. Plaintiffs further object to this request to the extent it calls for
 11 the production of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product
 12 doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, or that is otherwise privileged or immune from
 13 discovery. In addition, this request is compound, overbroad and contains multiple subparts, which
 14 if broken apart, contain numerous separate document requests. Subject to, and without waiving,
 15 the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

16 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
 17 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
 18 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
 19 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. At the present time, plaintiffs refer
 20 defendants to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in connection with the
 21 investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of employees of Chunghwa,
 22 the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European Commission Statement of
 23 Objections against CRT manufacturers.

24 DATED: May 7, 2010

By: /s/ Guido Saveri
 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.
 706 Sansome Street
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 217-6810
 Facsimile: (415) 217-6813

*Interim Lead Counsel for the Direct
 Purchaser Plaintiffs*

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Guido Saveri (22349) guido@saveri.com
2 R. Alexander Saveri (173102) rick@saveri.com
3 Geoffrey C. Rushing (126910) grushing@saveri.com
4 Cadio Zirpoli (179108) cadio@saveri.com
5 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.
6 706 Sansome Street
7 San Francisco, CA 94111
8 Telephone: (415) 217-6810
9 Facsimile: (415) 217-6813

10 *Interim Lead Counsel for the Direct Purchaser*
11 *Plaintiffs*

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

15 IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
16 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

MASTER FILE NO.. 07-cv-5944 SC

DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS'
RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT LG
ELECTRONICS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES

17 This Document Relates to:

18 ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

19 PROPOUNDING PARTY: LG ELECTRONICS, INC.

20 RESPONDING PARTY: DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

21 SET NO.: ONE

22 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, plaintiffs, by their
23 attorneys, object and respond to Defendant LG Electronics, Inc.'s First Set of Interrogatories to the
24 Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs (the "Interrogatories") as follows:

25 GENERAL OBJECTIONS

26 Each of the following objections is incorporated by reference into each of the responses
27 herein:

28 1. Plaintiffs generally object to the Interrogatories, including the Instructions and
Definitions, to the extent they purport to enlarge, expand or alter in any way the plain meaning and

813952.1

MDL NO. 1917

DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT LG ELECTRONICS, INC.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES

1 scope of any interrogatory or to impose any obligations on Plaintiffs' responses in excess of those
2 required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiffs will respond to these Interrogatories
3 in accordance with their understanding of the obligations imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil
4 Procedure.

5 2. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories, including the Instructions and Definitions, to
6 the extent the information sought is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work
7 product doctrine, or is otherwise privileged and/or immune from discovery. By responding to
8 these Interrogatories, Plaintiffs do not waive, intentionally or otherwise, any attorney-client
9 privilege, attorney work-product or any other privilege, immunity or other protection that may be
10 asserted to protect any information from disclosure. Accordingly, any response or production of
11 documents or disclosure of information inconsistent with the foregoing is wholly inadvertent and
12 shall not constitute a waiver of any such privilege, immunity or other applicable protection.

13 3. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they fail to state with sufficient
14 particularity the information and categories of information to be provided.

15 4. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they request-Plaintiffs to
16 produce documents outside their possession, custody, or control.

17 5. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they are overly broad and
18 unduly burdensome.

19 6. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they are vague or ambiguous.

20 7. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they require Plaintiffs to draw
21 legal conclusions.

22 8. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent the information requested is
23 neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

24 9. Plaintiffs object to Defendants' Interrogatories on the basis that Plaintiffs have not
25 yet had an opportunity to complete substantial discovery in this action, and no Defendant
26 depositions or other significant depositions have been taken. Thus, discovery is far from
27 complete. Under the circumstances, Defendants' Interrogatories are premature, and the responses
28 to the Interrogatories are not complete and are subject to full discovery in the case. Plaintiffs

1 reserve the right to modify their allegations based on additional discovery, additional analysis of
 2 existing discovery, discovery not yet completed and/or expert discovery, and Plaintiffs reserve the
 3 right to supplement and/or delete the responses given in light of further evidence and further
 4 analysis of present and subsequently acquired evidence.

5 10. In addition, in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs
 6 reserve the right to introduce evidence not yet identified herein supporting Plaintiffs' allegations,
 7 including evidence that Plaintiffs expect to further develop through the course of discovery and
 8 expert analysis. Plaintiffs reserve the right to supplement or modify any information, contention
 9 or analysis herein, including evidentiary materials as a result of expert analysis or discovery in this
 10 action.

11 11. Plaintiffs further object to the Interrogatories as being in the nature of contention
 12 Interrogatories when discovery has not been completed. To the extent that Defendants'
 13 Interrogatories request the contentions of Plaintiffs in this case, those contentions are set forth in
 14 large part in Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Consolidated Amended Complaint (the "Complaint").
 15 The allegations of the Complaint are incorporated by reference in each of the answers to the
 16 Interrogatories set forth herein.

17 12. In providing responses to the Interrogatories, Plaintiffs reserve all objections as to
 18 competency, relevance, materiality, privilege, or admissibility as evidence in any subsequent
 19 proceeding in, or trial of, this or any other action for any purpose whatsoever.

20 13. No incidental or implied admissions are intended in these responses. Plaintiffs'
 21 response to all or any part of any Interrogatory should not be taken as an admission that: (a)
 22 Plaintiffs accept or admit the existence of any fact(s) set forth or assumed by the Interrogatory; or
 23 (b) Plaintiffs' responses constitute admissible evidence. Plaintiffs' response to all or any part of an
 24 Interrogatory also is not intended to be, and shall not be, a waiver by Plaintiffs of all or any part of
 25 their objection(s) to that interrogatory.

RESPONSES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

28 State with specificity the factual basis (including any evidentiary sources) for Your

1 allegation that Defendants conspired, combined and contracted to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize
2 the price at which computer monitors containing CRTs were sold in the United States, as alleged
3 in, inter alia, Paragraph 3 of the Complaint.

4 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

5 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as being a premature contention interrogatory. *See In*
6 *re Convergent Technologies Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328 (N.D. Cal. 1985) ("[t]here is
7 considerable recent authority for the view that the wisest general policy is to defer propounding
8 and answering contention interrogatories until near the end of the discovery period."); *In re Ebay*
9 *Seller Antitrust Litig.*, No. C07-1882 JF (RS), 2008 WL 5212170 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008)
10 ("Courts using their Rule 33(a)(2) discretion generally disfavor contention interrogatories asked
11 before discovery is undertaken."). Discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
12 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
13 take depositions until November 1, 2010). Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
14 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
15 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
16 factual basis to support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested information is equally
17 available to the propounding party. This interrogatory is also objected to as being compound.
18 Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

19 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
20 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
21 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
22 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. Without waiving any of the general
23 objections, or specific objections set forth above, plaintiffs exercise their right under Federal Rule
24 of Civil Procedure 33(d) to refer to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in
25 connection with the investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of
26 employees of Chunghwa, the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European
27 Commission Statement of Objections against CRT manufacturers.

1 INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

2 State with specificity the factual basis (including any evidentiary sources) for Your
 3 allegation that Defendants agreed to allocate market shares and customers of sales of computer
 4 monitors containing CRTs, as alleged in, inter alia, Paragraphs 5 and 138 of the Complaint.

5 RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:

6 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as being a premature contention interrogatory. *See In*
 7 *re Convergent Technologies Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328 (N.D. Cal. 1985) ("[t]here is
 8 considerable recent authority for the view that the wisest general policy is to defer propounding
 9 and answering contention interrogatories until near the end of the discovery period."); *In re Ebay*
 10 *Seller Antitrust Litig.*, No. C07-1882 JF (RS), 2008 WL 5212170 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008)
 11 ("Courts using their Rule 33(a)(2) discretion generally disfavor contention interrogatories asked
 12 before discovery is undertaken."). Discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
 13 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
 14 take depositions until November 1, 2010). Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
 15 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
 16 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
 17 factual basis to support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested information is equally
 18 available to the propounding party. This interrogatory is also objected to as being compound.
 19 Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

20 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
 21 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
 22 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
 23 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. Without waiving any of the general
 24 objections, or specific objections set forth above, plaintiffs exercise their right under Federal Rule
 25 of Civil Procedure 33(d) to refer to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in
 26 connection with the investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of
 27 employees of Chunghwa, the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European
 28 Commission Statement of Objections against CRT manufacturers.

1 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

2 For each separate defendant (regardless of its affiliation with any other defendant), state
 3 with specificity the factual basis (including any Documents, Persons, or other evidentiary sources)
 4 for Your allegations that it conspired, combined, and contracted with any of the other Defendants
 5 to fix, raise, maintain and/or stabilize the prices of computer monitors containing CRTs sold in the
 6 United States, as alleged in, inter alia, Paragraph 3 of the Complaint.

7 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

8 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as being a premature contention interrogatory. *See In*
 9 *re Convergent Technologies Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328 (N.D. Cal. 1985) ("[t]here is
 10 considerable recent authority for the view that the wisest general policy is to defer propounding
 11 and answering contention interrogatories until near the end of the discovery period."); *In re Ebay*
 12 *Seller Antitrust Litig.*, No. C07-1882 JF (RS), 2008 WL 5212170 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008)
 13 ("Courts using their Rule 33(a)(2) discretion generally disfavor contention interrogatories asked
 14 before discovery is undertaken."). Discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
 15 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
 16 take depositions until November 1, 2010). Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
 17 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
 18 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
 19 factual basis to support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested information is equally
 20 available to the propounding party. This interrogatory is also objected to as being compound.
 21 Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

22 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
 23 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
 24 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
 25 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. Without waiving any of the general
 26 objections, or specific objections set forth above, plaintiffs exercise their right under Federal Rule
 27 of Civil Procedure 33(d) to refer to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in
 28 connection with the investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of

1 employees of Chunghwa, the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European
 2 Commission Statement of Objections against CRT manufacturers.

3 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

4 For each separate defendant (regardless of its affiliation with any other defendant), state
 5 with specificity the factual basis (including any Documents, persons, or other evidentiary sources)
 6 for Your allegations that it agreed to allocate market shares and customers of sales of computer
 7 monitors containing CRTs, as alleged in, inter alia, Paragraphs 5 and 138 of the Complaint.

8 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

9 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as being a premature contention interrogatory. *See In*
 10 *re Convergent Technologies Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328 (N.D. Cal. 1985) ("[t]here is
 11 considerable recent authority for the view that the wisest general policy is to defer propounding
 12 and answering contention interrogatories until near the end of the discovery period."); *In re Ebay*
 13 *Seller Antitrust Litig.*, No. C07-1882 JF (RS), 2008 WL 5212170 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008)
 14 ("Courts using their Rule 33(a)(2) discretion generally disfavor contention interrogatories asked
 15 before discovery is undertaken."). Discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
 16 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
 17 take depositions until November 1, 2010). Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
 18 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
 19 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
 20 factual basis to support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested information is equally
 21 available to the propounding party. This interrogatory is also objected to as being compound.
 22 Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

23 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
 24 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
 25 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
 26 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. Without waiving any of the general
 27 objections, or specific objections set forth above, plaintiffs exercise their right under Federal Rule
 28 of Civil Procedure 33(d) to refer to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in

1 connection with the investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of
2 employees of Chunghwa, the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European
3 Commission Statement of Objections against CRT manufacturers.

4 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

5 Identify each Person who provided information to answer these Interrogatories.

6 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

7 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly
8 burdensome and seeks information that is neither relevant nor calculated to lead to the discovery
9 of admissible evidence. Plaintiffs also object to the interrogatories on the basis of the attorney
10 work product privilege. Without waiver of or prejudice to these objections, information contained
11 in these responses was provided by counsel.

12 DATED: May 7, 2010

By: /s/ Guido Saveri
SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.
706 Sansome Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 217-6810
Facsimile: (415) 217-6813

*Interim Lead Counsel for the Direct
Purchaser Plaintiffs*

1 Guido Saveri (22349) guido@saveri.com
R. Alexander Saveri (173102) rick@saveri.com
2 Geoffrey C. Rushing (126910) grushing@saveri.com
Cadio Zirpoli (179108) cadio@saveri.com
3 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.
706 Sansome Street
4 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 217-6810
5 Facsimile: (415) 217-6813

6 *Interim Lead Counsel for the Direct Purchaser*
7 *Plaintiffs*

8
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

11
12 IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

MASTER FILE NO. 07-cv-5944 SC

MDL NO. 1917

13
14 This Document Relates to:

15 ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS'
RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT MT
PICTURE DISPLAY CO., LTD.'S FIRST
SET OF INTERROGATORIES

16
17
18 PROPOUNDING PARTY: MT PICTURE DISPLAY CO., LTD.

19 RESPONDING PARTY: DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

20 SET NO.: ONE

21 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, plaintiffs, by their
22 attorneys, object and respond to Defendant MT Picture Display Co., Ltd.'s First Set of
23 Interrogatories to the Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs (the "Interrogatories") as follows:

24 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

25 Each of the following objections is incorporated by reference into each of the responses
26 herein:

27 1. Plaintiffs generally object to the Interrogatories, including the Instructions and
28 Definitions, to the extent they purport to enlarge, expand or alter in any way the plain meaning and

813954.1

MDL NO. 1917

DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT MT PICTURE DISPLAY CO., LTD.'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES

1 scope of any interrogatory or to impose any obligations on Plaintiffs' responses in excess of those
2 required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Plaintiffs will respond to these Interrogatories
3 in accordance with their understanding of the obligations imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil
4 Procedure.

5 2. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories, including the Instructions and Definitions, to
6 the extent the information sought is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work
7 product doctrine, or is otherwise privileged and/or immune from discovery. By responding to
8 these Interrogatories, Plaintiffs do not waive, intentionally or otherwise, any attorney-client
9 privilege, attorney work-product or any other privilege, immunity or other protection that may be
10 asserted to protect any information from disclosure. Accordingly, any response or production of
11 documents or disclosure of information inconsistent with the foregoing is wholly inadvertent and
12 shall not constitute a waiver of any such privilege, immunity or other applicable protection.

13 3. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they fail to state with sufficient
14 particularity the information and categories of information to be provided.

15 4. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they request Plaintiffs to
16 produce documents outside their possession, custody, or control.

17 5. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they are overly broad and
18 unduly burdensome.

19 6. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they are vague or ambiguous.

20 7. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they require Plaintiffs to draw
21 legal conclusions.

22 8. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent the information requested is
23 neither relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

24 9. Plaintiffs object to Defendants' Interrogatories on the basis that Plaintiffs have not
25 yet had an opportunity to complete substantial discovery in this action, and no Defendant
26 depositions or other significant depositions have been taken. Thus, discovery is far from
27 complete. Under the circumstances, Defendants' Interrogatories are premature, and the responses
28 to the Interrogatories are not complete and are subject to full discovery in the case. Plaintiffs

1 reserve the right to modify their allegations based on additional discovery, additional analysis of
 2 existing discovery, discovery not yet completed and/or expert discovery, and Plaintiffs reserve the
 3 right to supplement and/or delete the responses given in light of further evidence and further
 4 analysis of present and subsequently acquired evidence.

5 10. In addition, in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs
 6 reserve the right to introduce evidence not yet identified herein supporting Plaintiffs' allegations,
 7 including evidence that Plaintiffs expect to further develop through the course of discovery and
 8 expert analysis. Plaintiffs reserve the right to supplement or modify any information, contention
 9 or analysis herein, including evidentiary materials as a result of expert analysis or discovery in this
 10 action.

11 11. Plaintiffs further object to the Interrogatories as being in the nature of contention
 12 Interrogatories when discovery has not been completed. To the extent that Defendants'
 13 Interrogatories request the contentions of Plaintiffs in this case, those contentions are set forth in
 14 large part in Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Consolidated Amended Complaint (the "Complaint").
 15 The allegations of the Complaint are incorporated by reference in each of the answers to the
 16 Interrogatories set forth herein.

17 12. In providing responses to the Interrogatories, Plaintiffs reserve all objections as to
 18 competency, relevance, materiality, privilege, or admissibility as evidence in any subsequent
 19 proceeding in, or trial of, this or any other action for any purpose whatsoever.

20 13. No incidental or implied admissions are intended in these responses. Plaintiffs'
 21 response to all or any part of any Interrogatory should not be taken as an admission that: (a)
 22 Plaintiffs accept or admit the existence of any fact(s) set forth or assumed by the Interrogatory; or
 23 (b) Plaintiffs' responses constitute admissible evidence. Plaintiffs' response to all or any part of an
 24 Interrogatory also is not intended to be, and shall not be, a waiver by Plaintiffs of all or any part of
 25 their objection(s) to that interrogatory.

26 RESPONSES

27 INTERROGATORY NO. 1:

28 Identify each Person who provided information to answer these Interrogatories.

813954.1

1 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 1:**

2 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory on the grounds that it is overbroad, unduly
3 burdensome and seeks information that is neither relevant nor calculated to lead to the discovery
4 of admissible evidence. Plaintiffs also object to the Interrogatories on the basis of the attorney
5 work product privilege. Without waiver of or prejudice to these objections, information contained
6 in these responses was provided by counsel.

7 **INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

8 State with specificity the factual basis (including the Identity of each Document, Person or
9 other evidentiary source upon which You rely) for Your allegation that Defendants conspired,
10 combined and contracted to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the price at which televisions
11 containing CRTs were sold in the United States, as alleged in, inter alia, Paragraph 3 of the
12 Complaint.

13 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 2:**

14 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as being a premature contention interrogatory. *See In*
15 *re Convergent Technologies Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328 (N.D. Cal. 1985) ("[t]here is
16 considerable recent authority for the view that the wisest general policy is to defer propounding
17 and answering contention interrogatories until near the end of the discovery period."); *In re Ebay*
18 *Seller Antitrust Litig.*, No. C07-1882 JF (RS), 2008 WL 5212170 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008)
19 ("Courts using their Rule 33(a)(2) discretion generally disfavor contention interrogatories asked
20 before discovery is undertaken."). Discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
21 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
22 take depositions until November 1, 2010). Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
23 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
24 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
25 factual basis to support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested information is equally
26 available to the propounding party. This interrogatory is also objected to as being compound.
27 Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

28 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs

1 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
 2 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
 3 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. Without waiving any of the general
 4 objections, or specific objections set forth above, plaintiffs exercise their right under Federal Rule
 5 of Civil Procedure 33(d) to refer to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in
 6 connection with the investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of
 7 employees of Chunghwa, the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European
 8 Commission Statement of Objections against CRT manufacturers.

9 **INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

10 State with specificity the factual basis (including the Identity of each Document, Person or
 11 other evidentiary source upon which You rely) for Your allegation that Defendants conspired,
 12 combined and contracted to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the price at which products
 13 containing CRTs were sold in the United States, as alleged in, inter alia, Paragraph 3 of the
 14 Complaint.

15 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 3:**

16 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as being a premature contention interrogatory. *See In*
 17 *re Convergent Technologies Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328 (N.D. Cal. 1985) ("[t]here is
 18 considerable recent authority for the view that the wisest general policy is to defer propounding
 19 and answering contention interrogatories until near the end of the discovery period."); *In re Ebay*
 20 *Seller Antitrust Litig.*, No. C07-1882 JF (RS), 2008 WL 5212170 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008)
 21 ("Courts using their Rule 33(a)(2) discretion generally disfavor contention interrogatories asked
 22 before discovery is undertaken."). Discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
 23 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
 24 take depositions until November 1, 2010). Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
 25 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
 26 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
 27 factual basis to support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested information is equally
 28 available to the propounding party. This interrogatory is also objected to as being compound.

1 Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

2 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
3 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
4 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
5 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. Without waiving any of the general
6 objections, or specific objections set forth above, plaintiffs exercise their right under Federal Rule
7 of Civil Procedure 33(d) to refer to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in
8 connection with the investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of
9 employees of Chunghwa, the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European
10 Commission Statement of Objections against CRT manufacturers.

11 **INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

12 State with specificity the factual basis (including the Identity of each Document, Person or
13 other evidentiary source upon which You rely) for Your allegation that Defendants agreed to
14 allocate market shares and customers of sales of televisions containing CRTs, as alleged in, inter
15 alia, Paragraphs 5 and 138 of the Complaint.

16 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 4:**

17 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as being a premature contention interrogatory. *See In*
18 *re Convergent Technologies Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328 (N.D. Cal. 1985) ("[t]here is
19 considerable recent authority for the view that the wisest general policy is to defer propounding
20 and answering contention interrogatories until near the end of the discovery period."); *In re Ebay*
21 *Seller Antitrust Litig.*, No. C07-1882 JF (RS), 2008 WL 5212170 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008)
22 ("Courts using their Rule 33(a)(2) discretion generally disfavor contention interrogatories asked
23 before discovery is undertaken."). Discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
24 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
25 take depositions until November 1, 2010). Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
26 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
27 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
28 factual basis to support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested information is equally

1 available to the propounding party. This interrogatory is also objected to as being compound.

2 Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

3 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
4 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
5 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
6 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. Without waiving any of the general
7 objections, or specific objections set forth above, plaintiffs exercise their right under Federal Rule
8 of Civil Procedure 33(d) to refer to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in
9 connection with the investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of
10 employees of Chunghwa, the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European
11 Commission Statement of Objections against CRT manufacturers.

12 **INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

13 State with specificity the factual basis (including the Identity of each Document, Person or
14 other evidentiary source upon which You rely) for Your allegation that Defendants agreed to
15 allocate market shares and customers of sales of products containing CRTs, other than televisions
16 and computer monitors, as alleged in, inter alia, Paragraphs 5 and 138 of the Complaint.

17 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:**

18 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as being a premature contention interrogatory. *See In*
19 *re Convergent Technologies Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328 (N.D. Cal. 1985) ("[t]here is
20 considerable recent authority for the view that the wisest general policy is to defer propounding
21 and answering contention interrogatories until near the end of the discovery period."); *In re Ebay*
22 *Seller Antitrust Litig.*, No. C07-1882 JF (RS), 2008 WL 5212170 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008)
23 ("Courts using their Rule 33(a)(2) discretion generally disfavor contention interrogatories asked
24 before discovery is undertaken."). Discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
25 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
26 take depositions until November 1, 2010). Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
27 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
28 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the

1 factual basis to support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested information is equally
 2 available to the propounding party. This interrogatory is also objected to as being compound.
 3 Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

4 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
 5 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
 6 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
 7 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. Without waiving any of the general
 8 objections, or specific objections set forth above, plaintiffs exercise their right under Federal Rule
 9 of Civil Procedure 33(d) to refer to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in
 10 connection with the investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of
 11 employees of Chunghwa, the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European
 12 Commission Statement of Objections against CRT manufacturers.

13 **INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

14 For each separate Defendant (regardless of its affiliation with any other Defendant), state
 15 with specificity the factual basis (including the Identity of each Document, Person or other
 16 evidentiary source upon which You rely) for Your allegations that it conspired, combined and
 17 contracted with any of the other Defendants to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the price at which
 18 televisions containing CRTs were sold in the United States, as alleged in, inter alia, Paragraph 3 of
 19 the Complaint, or agreed with any of the other Defendants to allocate market shares and customers
 20 of sales of televisions containing CRTs, as alleged in, inter alia, Paragraphs 5 and 138 of the
 21 Complaint.

22 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:**

23 Plaintiffs object to this interrogatory as being a premature contention interrogatory. *See In*
 24 *re Convergent Technologies Securities Litig.*, 108 F.R.D. 328 (N.D. Cal. 1985) ("[t]here is
 25 considerable recent authority for the view that the wisest general policy is to defer propounding
 26 and answering contention interrogatories until near the end of the discovery period."); *In re Ebay*
 27 *Seller Antitrust Litig.*, No. C07-1882 JF (RS), 2008 WL 5212170 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2008)
 28 ("Courts using their Rule 33(a)(2) discretion generally disfavor contention interrogatories asked

1 before discovery is undertaken."). Discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
2 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
3 take depositions until November 1, 2010). Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
4 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
5 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
6 factual basis to support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested information is equally
7 available to the propounding party. This interrogatory is also objected to as being compound.

8 Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

9 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
10 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
11 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
12 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. Without waiving any of the general
13 objections, or specific objections set forth above, plaintiffs exercise their right under Federal Rule
14 of Civil Procedure 33(d) to refer to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in
15 connection with the investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of
16 employees of Chunghwa, the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European
17 Commission Statement of Objections against CRT manufacturers.

18 DATED: May 7, 2010

19 By: /s/ Guido Saveri
20 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.
21 706 Sansome Street
22 San Francisco, CA 94111
23 Telephone: (415) 217-6810
24 Facsimile: (415) 217-6813

25 *Interim Lead Counsel for the Direct*
26 *Purchaser Plaintiffs*
27
28

1 Guido Saveri (22349) guido@saveri.com
 R. Alexander Saveri (173102) rick@saveri.com
 2 Geoffrey C. Rushing (126910) grushing@saveri.com
 Cadio Zirpoli (179108) cadio@saveri.com
 3 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.
 706 Sansome Street
 4 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 217-6810
 5 Facsimile: (415) 217-6813

6 *Interim Lead Counsel for the Direct Purchaser*
Plaintiffs

7
 8
 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 11

12 IN RE: CATHODE RAY TUBE (CRT)
 13 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

MASTER FILE NO. 07-cv-5944 SC

MDL NO. 1917

14 This Document Relates to:

15 ALL DIRECT PURCHASER ACTIONS

DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS'
 RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT MT
 PICTURE DISPLAY CO., LTD.'S FIRST
 SET OF DOCUMENT REQUESTS

18 PROPOUNDING PARTY: MT PICTURE DISPLAY CO., LTD.

19 RESPONDING PARTY: DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS

20 SET NO.: ONE

21 Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Direct Purchaser
 22 Plaintiffs ("Plaintiffs") hereby respond to defendant MT Picture Display Co., Ltd.'s First Set of
 23 Request for Production of Documents as follows:

24 **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

25 Nothing herein should be construed as an admission by Plaintiffs respecting the
 26 admissibility or relevance of any fact or document, or of the truth or accuracy of any
 27 characterization or statement of any kind contained in defendant MT Picture Display Co., Ltd.'s
 28 First Set of Request for Production of Documents ("Request for Production"). Plaintiffs have not

812454 2

MDL NO. 1917

DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSES TO
 DEFENDANT MT PICTURE DISPLAY CO., LTD.'S FIRST SET OF DOCUMENT REQUESTS

1 completed their investigation of the facts relating to this case or its preparation for trial. All
2 responses and objections contained herein are based only upon such information and such
3 documents as are presently available to and specifically known to Plaintiffs. It is anticipated that
4 independent investigation, legal research and analysis will supply additional facts and add
5 meaning to known facts, as well as establish entirely new factual conclusions and legal
6 contentions, all of which may lead to substantial additions to, changes in and variations from the
7 responses set forth herein.

8 The following objections and responses are made without prejudice to Plaintiffs' right to
9 produce at trial, or otherwise, evidence regarding any subsequently discovered information,
10 evidence and/or documents. Plaintiffs accordingly reserve the right to modify and amend any and
11 all responses herein as research is completed and contentions are made.

12 GENERAL OBJECTIONS

13 Plaintiffs object generally to the Request for Production, and to each individual request
14 therein, on the following grounds, each of which is incorporated by reference in the responses to
15 the individual requests below. Each response set forth below incorporates, is subject to, and does
16 not waive any of these general objections.

17 1. Plaintiffs object to each and every request to the extent that it seeks disclosure of
18 information containing privileged communications or other matters protected by the attorney-
19 client privilege, the work-product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege or doctrine. None of
20 Plaintiffs' specific responses shall be construed to mean that Plaintiffs intend to provide privileged
21 or work-product information in the absence of an intentional waiver. Any inadvertent disclosure
22 of privileged or work-product information shall not constitute a waiver of an otherwise valid claim
23 of privilege or other protection, and any failure to assert a privilege or other protection as to
24 certain information shall not be deemed to constitute a waiver of the privilege or other protection
25 as to any other information so protected.

26 2. The Request for Production, and certain of the requests contained therein, are
27 unreasonably overbroad in scope, and thus burdensome and oppressive, in that each such request
28 seeks information pertaining to items and matters that are not relevant to the subject matter of this

1 action, or, if relevant, are so remote therefrom as to make its disclosure of little or no practical
2 benefit to defendant, while placing a wholly unwarranted burden and expense on Plaintiffs in
3 locating, reviewing and producing the requested information.

4 3. The Request for Production, and certain of the requests contained therein, are
5 burdensome and oppressive, in that ascertaining the information necessary to respond thereto, and
6 to produce documents in accordance therewith, would require the review and compilation of
7 information from multiple locations, and voluminous records and files, thereby involving
8 substantial time of Plaintiffs' employees and great expense to Plaintiffs, whereas the information
9 sought to be obtained by defendant would be of little use or benefit to defendant.

10 4. The Request for Production, and certain of the requests contained therein, purports
11 to impose on Plaintiffs obligations or responsibilities in excess of those imposed by the Federal
12 Rules of Civil Procedure, the applicable Local Rules, any other applicable procedural rules, case
13 law, statutes governing the proper scope of discovery, or applicable Court Orders.

14 5. The Request for Production, and certain of the requests contained therein, calls for
15 documents which are outside the possession, custody or control of Plaintiffs.

16 6. Plaintiffs object to each request, instruction, or definition to the extent it seeks
17 information that is already in the possession of the propounding party or the other defendants or is
18 obtainable from some other source that is more convenient, less burdensome or less expensive.

19 7. Plaintiffs object to each request, instruction, or definition to the extent that it
20 impermissibly seeks the premature disclosure of experts and expert information or requires
21 Plaintiffs to disclose analyses, comparative analyses, opinions, or theories that will be the subject
22 of expert testimony.

23 8. To the extent any term in the Request for Production is defined in the Federal
24 Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs will interpret such term as it is so defined and not as defined in
25 the Request for Production.

26 9. The Request for Production, and certain of the requests contained therein, seek to
27 have Plaintiffs furnish information and identify documents that are a matter of public record and,
28 therefore, are equally available to the propounding party as they are to Plaintiffs.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1:

Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. At the present time, plaintiffs refer defendants to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in connection with the

1 investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of employees of Chunghwa,
2 the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European Commission Statement of
3 Objections against CRT manufacturers.

4 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:**

5 All Documents that support Your response to Interrogatory No. 3.

6 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2:**

7 Plaintiffs incorporate the General Objections as though fully set forth herein. In particular,
8 this request is premature in that discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
9 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
10 take depositions until November 1, 2010). This request seeks, in effect, a list of trial exhibits
11 which is not yet required to be produced. Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
12 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
13 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
14 documents that support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested documents are equally
15 available to the propounding party. Plaintiffs further object to this request to the extent it calls for
16 the production of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product
17 doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, or that is otherwise privileged or immune from
18 discovery. In addition, this request is compound, overbroad and contains multiple subparts, which
19 if broken apart, contain numerous separate document requests. Subject to, and without waiving,
20 the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

21 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
22 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
23 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
24 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. At the present time, plaintiffs refer
25 defendants to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in connection with the
26 investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of employees of Chunghwa,
27 the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European Commission Statement of
28 Objections against CRT manufacturers.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

All Documents that support Your response to Interrogatory No. 4.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3:

Plaintiffs incorporate the General Objections as though fully set forth herein. In particular, this request is premature in that discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to take depositions until November 1, 2010). This request seeks, in effect, a list of trial exhibits which is not yet required to be produced. Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the documents that support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested documents are equally available to the propounding party. Plaintiffs further object to this request to the extent it calls for the production of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, or that is otherwise privileged or immune from discovery. In addition, this request is compound, overbroad and contains multiple subparts, which if broken apart, contain numerous separate document requests. Subject to, and without waiving, the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. At the present time, plaintiffs refer defendants to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in connection with the investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of employees of Chunghwa, the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European Commission Statement of Objections against CRT manufacturers.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:

All Documents that support Your response to Interrogatory No. 5.

1 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4:**

2 Plaintiffs incorporate the General Objections as though fully set forth herein. In particular,
 3 this request is premature in that discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to
 4 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
 5 take depositions until November 1, 2010). This request seeks, in effect, a list of trial exhibits
 6 which is not yet required to be produced. Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
 7 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
 8 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
 9 documents that support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested documents are equally
 10 available to the propounding party. Plaintiffs further object to this request to the extent it calls for
 11 the production of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product
 12 doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, or that is otherwise privileged or immune from
 13 discovery. In addition, this request is compound, overbroad and contains multiple subparts, which
 14 if broken apart, contain numerous separate document requests. Subject to, and without waiving,
 15 the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

16 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
 17 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
 18 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
 19 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. At the present time, plaintiffs refer
 20 defendants to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in connection with the
 21 investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of employees of Chunghwa,
 22 the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European Commission Statement of
 23 Objections against CRT manufacturers.

24 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:**

25 All Documents that support Your response to Interrogatory No. 6.

26 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5:**

27 Plaintiffs incorporate the General Objections as though fully set forth herein. In particular,
 28 this request is premature in that discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to

1 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
2 take depositions until November 1, 2010). This request seeks, in effect, a list of trial exhibits
3 which is not yet required to be produced. Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
4 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
5 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
6 documents that support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested documents are equally
7 available to the propounding party. Plaintiffs further object to this request to the extent it calls for
8 the production of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product
9 doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, or that is otherwise privileged or immune from
10 discovery. In addition, this request is compound, overbroad and contains multiple subparts, which
11 if broken apart, contain numerous separate document requests. Subject to, and without waiving,
12 the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

13 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
14 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
15 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
16 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. At the present time, plaintiffs refer
17 defendants to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in connection with the
18 investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of employees of Chunghwa,
19 the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European Commission Statement of
20 Objections against CRT manufacturers.

21 **REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:**

22 All other documents that purportedly support Your allegations that Defendants conspired,
23 combined and contracted to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the price at which finished products
24 containing CRTs were sold in the United States, or agreed to allocate market shares and customers
25 of sales of finished products containing CRTs.

26 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6:**

27 Plaintiffs incorporate the General Objections as though fully set forth herein. In particular,
28 this request is premature in that discovery has just started, defendants have not responded to

1 plaintiffs' interrogatories, and plaintiffs have not taken any depositions (and are not permitted to
 2 take depositions until November 1, 2010). This request seeks, in effect, a list of trial exhibits
 3 which is not yet required to be produced. Moreover, on March 8, 2010, certain defendants
 4 produced to all parties in this litigation, documents that had previously been produced to the
 5 Department of Justice in response to a grand jury subpoena. That production contains some of the
 6 documents that support plaintiffs' allegations. Accordingly, the requested documents are equally
 7 available to the propounding party. Plaintiffs further object to this request to the extent it calls for
 8 the production of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work-product
 9 doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, or that is otherwise privileged or immune from
 10 discovery. In addition, this request is compound, overbroad and contains multiple subparts, which
 11 if broken apart, contain numerous separate document requests. Subject to, and without waiving,
 12 the foregoing objections, plaintiffs respond as follows:

13 Plaintiffs anticipate receiving substantial additional discovery. At such time as plaintiffs
 14 have had an opportunity to review and analyze material previously produced to the Department of
 15 Justice and the additional material sought by plaintiffs, they will meet and confer with defendants
 16 to work out a schedule for supplementing these responses. At the present time, plaintiffs refer
 17 defendants to the documents produced to the Department of Justice in connection with the
 18 investigation of the Cathode Ray Tube industry, the three indictments of employees of Chunghwa,
 19 the JFTC findings against CRT manufacturers and the European Commission Statement of
 20 Objections against CRT manufacturers.

21 DATED: May 7, 2010

By: /s/ Guido Saveri
 SAVERI & SAVERI, INC.
 706 Sansome Street
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 217-6810
 Facsimile: (415) 217-6813

*Interim Lead Counsel for the Direct
 Purchaser Plaintiffs*